



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/697,849

10/30/2003

Andrew Doddington

14846-30

9764

28221 7590 09/15/2009
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE
ROSELAND, NJ 07068

EXAMINER

OYEBISI, OJO O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/697,849	Applicant(s) DODDINGTON, ANDREW	
	Examiner OJO O. OYEBISI	Art Unit 3696	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11-14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11-14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/25/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/25/09 has been entered. In the RCE filed on 08/25/09, the following have occurred: Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are pending, Claims 1, 11-14 and 20 have been amended, Claims 2, 5, 6, 10, 15, 18 and 21-28 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu et al (US PAT: 6347307) in view of Reed (US Pat: 6,757,710).

Re claim 1. Sandhu discloses a computer-implemented method for modeling a financial product, comprising the steps of: displaying on a first visual display a palette of objects for constructing a financial product (see fig.17 element 1250, see fig.18 element 1350, see col.48 lines 50-67); displaying on the first visual display at least one window for graphically representing the financial product in the form of a tree that includes a hierarchy of entities (i.e., typically financial objects will be stored on the user's internal system as Java objects, which are in the form of object graphs. Such object graphs consist of inter-linked nodes representing the elements and the attributes of the financial object, see col.48 lines 56-62, see fig.3-6, also see col.49 lines 20-60); and selecting objects from the palette to construct the financial product (i.e., In some embodiments of this invention, XML object mappings 1410 may be customized by the user, in order to correspond to the form and structure of the user's proprietary financial objects, see col.48 lines 65-66, also see col.49 lines 23-60), wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity, configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being Factory entity triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product (Sandhu discloses that XML object mappings maybe customized by the user to correspond to the user's proprietary financial objects – see col.48 lines 62-67. Thus the user can inherently configure one of the objects to monitor the financial product). Sandhu does not explicitly disclose wherein selecting the objects from the palette

Art Unit: 3696

includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window. However, Reed discloses selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window (i.e., The resulting icon 1542 would then be ready for use. The user could then add other communications **object** system users to this discussion, such as Mary 5146 and Trent 5147, by **dragging** their icons from the user **palette** 5131 and dropping them on top of the discussion group icon 5126, see col.143 lines 50-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Reed to allow a pointing device to be used to select one or more screen objects for action by a program command

Re claim 3. Sandhu further discloses the method wherein the tree structure corresponds to an XML document (i.e., FinXML trade element structure, see fig.3, also see fig.7 elements 1100, 1110, 1120, also see col.37 lines 40-60).

Re claim 4. Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein an XML schema defines a valid structure for the XML document (i.e., FinXML events element structure, see fig.6)

Re claim 7. Sandhu further discloses the method, further including displaying the attributes of an entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 8. Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein displaying the attributes of an entity includes displaying an attribute name and corresponding attribute values (see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 9. Sandhu further discloses the method, further including editing an entity using a data entry form (see col.48 lines 50-67)

Re claim 11. Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein the watcher entity

Art Unit: 3696

generates an output message when triggered (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 12. Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein the Watcher entity is a Logging Watcher entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 13. Sandhu further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the Watcher entity is an Action Watcher entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 14. Sandhu further discloses a computer system for modeling a financial product, comprising: a display device for displaying a palette of objects for constructing a financial product (see fig.17 element 1250, see fig.18 element 1350, see col.48 lines 50-67) and a window for graphically representing the financial model in the form of a tree that includes a hierarchy of entities (i.e., typically financial objects will be stored on the user's internal system as Java objects, which are in the form of object graphs. Such object graphs consist of inter-linked nodes representing the elements and the attributes of the financial object (see col.48 lines 56-62); an input device for selecting objects from the palette; and a processor configured to construct the financial model using the selected objects (i.e., In some embodiments of this invention, XML object mappings 1410 may be customized by the user, in order to correspond to the form and structure of the user's proprietary financial objects, see col.48 lines 65-66, also see col.49 lines 23-60), wherein at least one of the objects is a wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity, configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being Factory entity triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product (Sandhu discloses that XML object mappings maybe customized by the user to

Art Unit: 3696

correspond to the user's proprietary financial objects - see col.48 lines 62-67). Thus the user can inherently configure one of the objects to monitor the financial product).

Sandhu does not explicitly disclose wherein selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window. However, Reed discloses selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window (i.e., The resulting icon 1542 would then be ready for use. The user could then add other communications ~~object~~ system users to this discussion, such as Mary 5146 and Trent 5147, by ~~dragging~~ their icons from the user ~~palette~~ 5131 and dropping them on top of the discussion group icon 5126, see col.143 lines 50-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Reed to allow a pointing device to be used to select one or more screen objects for action by a program command.

Re claim 16. Sandhu further discloses the system wherein the tree structure corresponds to an XML document (i.e., FinXML trade element structure, see fig.3, also see fig.7 elements 1100, 1110, 1120, also see col.37 lines 40-60).

Re claim 17. Sandhu further discloses the system, wherein an XML schema defines a valid structure for the XML document (i.e., FinXML events element structure, see fig.6)


Re claim 19. Sandhu further discloses the system, wherein the tree structure includes a hierarchy of entities, each of the entities having at least one attribute name and a corresponding attribute value(see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

Re claim 20. Sandhu further discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable on the machine to

Art Unit: 3696

perform method steps for modeling a financial product, the method steps comprising: displaying a palette of objects for constructing a financial product product (see fig.17 element 1250, see fig.18 element 1350, see col.48 lines 50-67); displaying at least one window for graphically representing the financial product in the form of a tree that includes a hierarchy of entities (i.e., typically financial objects will be stored on the user's internal system as Java objects, which are in the form of object graphs. Such object graphs consist of inter-linked nodes representing the elements and the attributes of the financial object, see col.48 lines 56-62); and selecting objects from the palette to construct the financial product (i.e., In some embodiments of this invention, XML object mappings 1410 may be customized by the user, in order to correspond to the form and structure of the user's proprietary financial objects, see col.48 lines 65-66, also see col.49 lines 23-60); wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product (Sandhu discloses that XML object mappings maybe customized by the user to correspond to the user's proprietary financial objects – see col.48 lines 62-67. Thus the user can inherently configure one of the objects to monitor the financial product). Sandhu does not explicitly disclose wherein selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window. However, Reed discloses selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window (i.e.,The resulting icon 1542 would then be ready for use. The user could then add other communications ~~object~~ system users to this discussion, such as Mary 5146 and Trent 5147, by ~~dragging~~ their icons from the user

Art Unit: 3696

 5131 and dropping them on top of the discussion group icon 5126, see col.143 lines 50-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Reed to allow a pointing device to be used to select one or more screen objects for action by a program command.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/26/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues in substance that neither Sandhu nor Reed discloses “wherein at least one of the objects is a Watcher entity configured to monitor the modeled financial product, the Watcher entity being triggered in response to a change in the modeled financial product “. Contrary to the applicant’s assertion, Sandhu discloses that XML object mappings maybe customized by the user to correspond to the user's proprietary financial objects – see col.48 lines 62-67. Thus the user can inherently configure one of the objects to monitor the financial product.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OJO O. OYEBISI whose telephone number is (571)272-8298. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A.M-5:30P.M.

Art Unit: 3696

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571)272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/OJO O OYEBISI/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696